

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 STEVEN YOURKE,

No. C 03-03105 CRB

12 Plaintiff,

ORDER AND STAY

13 v.

14 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
15 FRANCISCO, et al.,

16 Defendants.
17 _____/

18 Now pending before the Court is a second round of cross motions for summary
19 judgment in this matter. On September 3, 2004, the Court denied plaintiff's motion for
20 summary judgment on his Monell claim and granted summary judgment for defendants on
21 plaintiff's false arrest claim. On February 23, 2006, the Court issued a Memorandum and
22 Order in a related case, Mary Bull, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al., No. C
23 03-1840 CRB, which included a determination as to qualified immunity. As a result of that
24 Order, plaintiff moved for partial summary judgment in this matter. Thereafter, defendants
25 cross-moved for summary judgment as to all claims. The Memorandum and Order denying
26 qualified immunity in Bull is presently on appeal before the Ninth Circuit.


27 //

28 //

1 Good cause appearing, the Court hereby DENIES all motions without prejudice. The
2 parties may re-notice their motions for summary judgment after the Ninth Circuit issues its
3 decision in Bull. All discovery shall be stayed until further notice from the Court.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6
7 Dated: June 27, 2006



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California